Remarks/Arguments:

Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter is introduced herein. Claim 1 is pending.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the IC card adapter apparatus conducts polling to the IC card. In addition, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that, when an external radio wave accessing the IC card is detected responsive to the polling, an interfering wave is output from the IC card adapter apparatus such that data output from the IC card is transmitted together with the interfering wave. No new matter is introduced herein. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, at page 20, lines 1-11, of the original specification.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fischer et al. (US 5,552,641). It is respectfully submitted, however, that this claim is patentable over the cited art for the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1, as amended, includes features neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, namely:

> ... wherein the IC card adapter apparatus conducts polling to the IC card which comes close to the IC card adapter apparatus, when an external radio wave accessing the IC card is detected responsive to the polling, an interfering wave is output from the IC card adapter apparatus such that data output from the IC card is transmitted together with the interfering wave. (Emphasis added).

Applicants' claim 1 related to an IC card adapter apparatus which outputs an interfering wave when, responsive to polling, an external radio wave accessing an IC card is detected. As described in the subject specification, at page 20, lines 5-11, an interfering wave is output when it is determined that an apparatus accesses the IC card without authorization. The claimed IC card adapter apparatus outputs the interfering wave such that data output from the IC card is transmitted together with the interfering wave. Because the interfering wave is transmitted together with the data from the IC card, the interfering wave prevents the unauthorized device from receiving the data output by the IC card, causing the data not to be normally received by the unauthorized device.

Fischer et al. disclose, in Fig. 1, a keyless remote-control access control device. The device includes stationery transmitter and receiver unit 1 disposed in motor vehicle 4 and portable transponder 2 located away from motor vehicle 4. Operation of door handle 45 causes unit 1 to begin a question and answer dialogue with transponder 2. (Column 4, lines 1-15). During the question and answer dialogue, unit 1 transmits a question code signal and transponder 2 replies to the question code signal with an answer code signal. Unit 1 compares the answer code signal with an expected command code signal in order to unlock vehicle 4. (Column 4, lines 19-31).

Fischer et al. describe that errors may occur during communication between unit 1 and transponder 2. One error may be caused by interference by a stronger interfering transmitter broadcasting in the general vicinity of vehicle 4. (Column 5, line 66-Column 6, line 6). Fischer et al. address the problem of an interference signal by having transponder 2 simultaneously transmit the answer code signal over various transmission channels. By transmitting the answer code signal over various transmission channels, transponder 2 insures that the answer code signal can be received by at least one of the transmission channels of unit 1. (Column 7, lines 46-64).

Fischer et al., however, do not disclose or suggest outputting an interfering wave from an IC card adapter apparatus, when an external radio wave is detected, such that data output from the IC card is transmitted together with the interfering wave, as required by claim 1 (emphasis added). Fischer et al. are silent regarding these features. Instead, Fischer et al. teach ways of dealing with interfering signals that interfere with the transmission, such that an answer code signal is received by unit 1 (i.e., without an interfering signal). Thus, Fischer et al. do not include all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515
Attorney for Applicants

LEA/dmw

Dated: October 1, 2009

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

NM483336